

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL,) No. C-04-04448 SC
INC., COMMITTEE TO BRIDGE THE GAP,)
and CITY OF LOS ANGELES,)
Plaintiffs,) ORDER GRANTING
v.) PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, SPENCER) FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
ABRAHAM, Secretary, Department of)
Energy, and CAMILE YUAN-SOO HOO,)
Manager, National Nuclear Security)
Administration, Oakland Operations)
Office,)
Defendants.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., Committee to Bridge the Gap, and City of Los Angeles ("Plaintiffs") bring this action against the Department of Energy ("DOE"), Spencer Abraham, Secretary, DOE, Camille Yuan-Soo Hoo, Manager, Nuclear Security Administration, Oakland Operations Office ("Defendants" or "DOE").

Plaintiffs allege that the DOE's March 2003 decision regarding the remediation of Area IV of Santa Susana Field Laboratory in Simi Valley, California violates the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321, et seq., the

1 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability
 2 Act of 1980 ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. §§9601, et seq., and the
 3 Endangered Species Act ("ESA"), 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531, et seq. See
 4 Compl. at 4.

5 In summary, Plaintiffs challenge 1) the DOE's decision to
 6 issue a Finding of No Significant Impact ("FONSI") after
 7 conducting an Environmental Assessment ("EA"), as opposed to
 8 preparing a further, more in depth, Environmental Impact Statement
 9 ("EIS"); and 2) the manner with which the DOE has subsequently
 10 chosen to conduct the remediation of Area IV. See Compl. On this
 11 basis, the Complaint requests that the Court:

12 1) declare that Defendants "have violated, and continue
 13 to violate, NEPA, CERCLA, the ESA" and the
 14 Administrative Procedures Act ("APA");

15 2) "set aside . . . defendants' March 31, 2003 FONSI on
 16 the AREA IV cleanup";

17 3) "preliminarily and permanently enjoin the
 18 [Defendants] from transferring ownership or possession
 19 of, or otherwise relinquishing control over, any portion
 20 of Area IV until defendants have (a) completed an EIS
 21 and issued a Record of Decision pursuant to NEPA; (b)
 22 complied with CERCLA's standards and completed the
 23 CERCLA process; and (c) obtained a Biological Opinion
 24 from FWS [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service] pursuant to
 25 the ESA";¹

26 4) "retain jurisdiction of this matter until the

27 ¹On February 17, 2005, the parties submitted a Joint Case
 28 Management Statement and Proposed Order, in which Defendants inter
alia stipulated that "[t]he cleanup at ETEC is on-going and
 Defendants do not anticipate that it will be completed prior to the
 conclusion of the briefing schedule" and further "agree[d] to give
 Plaintiffs notice of at least thirty days prior to the completion
 of the cleanup as described in the EA and the subsequent transfer
 of control or ownership of the land or facilities which are at
 issue in this case." Docket No. 15 at 5. This stipulation mooted
 Plaintiffs' request for a preliminary injunction.

1 [Defendants] have fulfilled all of their legal
2 obligations under NEPA, CERCLA, the ESA, and the APA";
and

3 5) award plaintiffs costs, attorneys fees,
4 disbursements, and any other relief the Court deems
proper.

5 Compl. at 27-28. Plaintiffs have supplemented their NEPA-related
6 requests for relief with an alternative prayer for an order by the
7 Court requiring the DOE to supplement the EA in light of new
8 information which has recently arisen. See Plaintiffs' Memorandum
9 is Support of Motion for Summary Judgment ("Mot.") at 34.

10 Plaintiffs move the Court for Summary Judgment, see Mot., and
11 the DOE cross-moves for the same. See Cross-Mot. The parties
12 have stipulated that the case does involve any significant factual
13 disputes and should be able to be resolved through these cross-
14 motions for summary judgment. See Docket No. 15 at 3-4. For the
15 reasons contained herein, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion as
16 it relates to their NEPA claims, and RESERVES JUDGMENT on both
17 parties' Motions as they relate to Plaintiffs' CERCLA and ESA
18 related claims.

19
20
21 **II. BACKGROUND**

22 This action concerns the DOE's remediation of a portion of
23 the Santa Susana Field Laboratory ("SSFL"), known as "Area IV."
24 See Compl. at 1.

25 **A. Area IV**

26 Area IV is located on approximately 290 acres of the SSFL's
27 Northwest corner, which slopes, generally, to the Southeast

1 towards Los Angeles. See Administrative Record ("AR")-264 at
2 10928, 10965.² The SSFL is an area of approximately 2,850 acres
3 of land "atop a range of hills between Simi and San Fernando
4 Valleys in southeastern Ventura County, California." Id. at
5 10928.

6 As of March 2003, the closest residential area to Area IV, an
7 area of Simi Valley, was 1.7 miles to the Northwest; another
8 community, Santa Susana Knolls, was located 3 miles to the
9 Northeast of Area IV; the Bell Canyon, which appears to be a semi-
10 rural populated area, began 1.4 miles to the Southeast of Area IV.
11 See id. at 10964. In total, the DOE estimated that, as of March
12 2003, 1,403 people lived within two miles of the center of the
13 SSFL and 69,398 lived within five miles. See id. Area IV's
14 other neighbors include: the Santa Monica Mountains National
15 Recreation Area, two state parks, and a 3,000 acre Jewish
16 educational center and camp facility ("the Camp"). See id. An
17 endangered plant, Brauton's milkvetch, is found in the SSFL. See
18 SAR-13 at 1762.

19 Most of the SSFL, which totals 2,399.3 acres, is the property
20 of the Rocketdyne Propulsion & Power Division ("Rocketdyne") of
21 The Boeing Company; the remaining 451.2 acres is the property of
22 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration ("NASA"). See
23 AR-264 at 10965. However, the DOE is "responsible for the
24

25 ² Citations to the AR and Supplemental Administrative Record
26 ("SAR") will note the AR number or SAR number along with Bates
27 number pinpoint citation, except when a Bates number is not
28 available. In the latter cases, the documents internal numbering
system will be used.

1 operation of Energy Technology Engineering Center (ETEC), a
2 government-owned complex of buildings located within Area IV."
3 Id. at 10928. This includes the responsibility "to remediate the
4 site prior to returning the site to the owner, Boeing Canoga
5 Park." AR-114 at 6024. The instant case concerns this
6 remediation. See Compl.

7 From the mid-1950's to the mid-1990's, the DOE and its
8 predecessor agencies operated the ETEC as a "testing facility . .
9 . primarily for the testing of components for nuclear energy,
10 solar energy, and geothermal energy." Id.; see AR-264 at 10928.
11 At its peak, "the ETEC consisted of over 200 facilities," id. at
12 10938, including ten nuclear research reactors, seven criticality
13 test facilities, "the Hot Laboratory, the Nuclear Materials
14 Development Facility, the Radioactive Materials Handling Facility
15 (RMHF), and various test and nuclear material storage areas." Id.
16 at 10934. According to the Environmental Protection Agency
17 ("EPA"), these facilities housed to two main DOE-activities: 1)
18 "nuclear operations," which involved "development, fabrication,
19 disassembly, and examination of nuclear reactors, reactor fuel,
20 and other radiological materials"; and 2) "liquid sodium testing
21 of liquid metal fast breeder reactor components." AR-80 at 5918;
22 see also AR-264 at 10934 (analogous DOE description).

23 The DOE and EPA concur that as a result of these activities
24 at least some parts of Area IV "became radioactively activated or
25 contaminated," id. (DOE); see also AR-80 at 5918 (EPA), and at
26 least some parts of Area IV contain chemical contaminants. See
27
28

1 id. (EPA); AR-264 at 10937 (DOE). The radiological contamination
2 appears to be the result of the regular operation of the
3 facilities, see id. at 10934, dumping of radioactive materials,
4 see AR-158 at 7476, 7476, and at least nine nuclear accidents.
5 See AR-78 at 5756-9. Among these accidents was the partial melt-
6 down of one of the facilities' nuclear reactors in 1959. See AR-
7 264 at 11062. The DOE's Final EA identified five "potential
8 radionuclides of concern at Area IV[:] . . . uranium-238, thorium-
9 232, cesium-137, strontium-90, and cobalt-60." AR-264 at 11026.
10 Ground water samples taken at the SSFL in recent years have
11 detected the radioactive substance tritium. See SAR-1806.

12 The DOE has stated little on the record regarding the causes,
13 types, or extent of chemical contamination of Area IV, but the
14 Final EA noted that "[h]azardous materials such as asbestos and
15 lead-based paint were also used in ETEC facilities." See id. at
16 10934. The EPA, however, has found that, in addition,
17 "hydrocarbons, metals, solvents, and polychlorinated biphenyls
18 (PCBs) . . . may have been used or generated in ETEC's historic
19 operations and/or may be present in existing facilities, soils,
20 groundwater, or other media." AR-80 at 5924. The California
21 Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC") has identified
22 perchlorate contamination in the SSFL and areas surrounding the
23 SSFL including Simi Valley and the Camp. See SAR-13 at 1780.

24 Following the decision to close the ETEC in 1996, many of its
25 facilities were "decontaminated, decommissioned, and demolished"
26 in a process that was categorically excluded from the application
27
28

1 NEPA. AR-264 at 10938. As of the date of the Final EA's
2 issuance, "[a]pproximately 64 structures remain[ed]." Id.

3 B. Rocketdyne Survey

4 Preceding the 1996 closure decision, between March 1994 and
5 September 1995, Rocketdyne undertook a survey of Area IV "to
6 locate and characterize any previously unknown areas of elevated
7 radioactivity in Area IV" ("Rocketdyne Survey"). AR-2 at 52.

8 Rocketdyne issued its final report based on the Survey on August
9 15, 1996. Id. The DOE's motion papers refer to the Survey as a
10 DOE endeavor. See Defs' Cross-Mot. at 4. The Final EA states
11 explicitly that "[t]he impacts of Alternatives 1 and 2 and the No
12 Action Alternative described in [the Final EA] are based on soil
13 sampling data collected on Area IV by Rocketdyne." AR-264 at
14 11018; see also, AR-67 at 3-2.

15 1. EPA Criticism of the Rocketdyne Survey

16 Upon issuance, the EPA was highly critical of the Rocketdyne
17 Survey, faulting its methodology on several accounts and
18 ultimately calling for it to be scrapped and redone. See AR-271
19 at 11910.

20 On April 8, 1997 the EPA sent a letter to Boeing, the
21 subsequent owner of Rocketdyne, to which was attached an internal
22 EPA memo. See AR-340. The letter itself focused mainly on the 15
23 millirems per year radiation exposure screening level employed in
24 the survey, see AR-340 at 12613. The memo also detailed several
25 more specific concerns over the Survey's methodology, which the
26 memo's author had raised in a previous telephone call with a
27

Boeing official. See AR-340 at 12613, 12615-17.

The memo cited a number of problems with how the survey was conducted which "leads to the conclusion that the survey could have missed radionuclides in the ground or buried sources." Id. at 12616. These included: the "grid distance" used in the survey; the depth to which the detectors were capable of penetrating the earth, which appeared to be, at best, one foot; the calibration, size, and number of detectors used; how the detectors were used in the walking survey, which the memo characterized as "much too fast to allow the instrument to respond or an operator to note the response"; and "techniques . . . used to identify where soil samples are collected." Id. at 12615-16.

The memo also cited several problems with the way the survey analyzed data, such as: failures to address data "anomalies"; inadequate addressment of inconsistent data quality between contractors; and problems with the locations used as controls. Id. at 12616-17.

Finally, the memo cited the survey's exclusion of 25% of Area IV from the study, which, the memo stated, results in "the reader [being] left wondering" about the condition of the entire site. Id. at 12617.

A few months after the April 8, 1997 letter and after a meeting with Rocketdyne officials regarding the survey, the EPA sent Rocketdyne another letter on July 11, 1997. See AR-271. The letter strongly expressed the EPA's displeasure with the Rocketdyne Survey and with Boeing/Rocketdyne's response to the

1 EPA's previous expressions of concern. See id. The letter stated
2 flatly "we do not believe that Rocketdyne's survey was sufficient
3 to find potentially unknown areas of contamination." AR-271 at
4 11910. It clarified further that while accepting that Boeing and
5 the EPA could seek to resolve their "differences on the
6 appropriate clean-up level for Area IV" at a later time, the EPA's
7 "principal concern is the overall quality of the survey." Id.
8 The letter recognized "Rocketdyne must rely on the quality of the
9 Area IV survey as the primary method to find unknown radiation
10 contamination." Id. And thus, in light of the problems which
11 the EPA had identified with the survey, the letter's author
12 personally stated: "I am now asking, in writing, that Rocketdyne
13 conduct a new Survey of Area IV." AR-271.

14 2. Abandoned Plan for Collaborative Survey of Area IV
15 by EPA and DOE

16 Following this exchange, the DOE and EPA apparently agreed on
17 a plan which would have allowed the EPA to conduct a survey of
18 Area IV, See AR-78 at 5723. On December 8, 1998, the EPA sent a
19 letter to United States Senator Dianne Feinstein in response to a
20 previous inquiry by the Senator regarding the EPA's involvement in
21 the cleanup of SSFL. See AR-78 at 5723. The EPA informed Senator
22 Feinstein that the DOE and EPA had agreed on a plan "allowing the
23 EPA to conduct the final survey of Area IV," and that the EPA was
24 "extremely pleased" by this result. AR-78 at 5723.

25 On May 5, 1999, Senator Feinstein sent a letter to the DOE
26 enclosing a letter the Senator had sent to President Clinton
27 regarding the DOE's planned cleanup of Area IV, which noted the
28

1 Senator's particular concern with the DOE's chosen 15 milirem
2 cleanup level. AR-275 at 11958-59. On August 24, 1999, Senator
3 Barbara Boxer sent a letter to the DOE expressing very similar
4 concerns. AR-275 at 11950-11553. The DOE's responses to both
5 Senators referenced inter alia the DOE's plan to "work
6 collaboratively with EPA" on the clean-up of Area IV. Id. at
7 11956 (May 20, 1999 DOE letter to Sen. Feinstein); see also id. at
8 11961 (May 5, 1999 DOE letter to Sen. Feinstein); id. at 11955
9 (DOE Sep. 29, 1999 letter to Sen. Boxer).

10 On March 31, 2000, the DOE sent a letter to the EPA which
11 appeared to confirm the commitments the DOE had made to
12 California's U.S. Senators to coordinate the clean-up of Area IV
13 with the EPA. AR-213 ("Summary of Commitments to EPA Regarding
14 Cleanup Activities at ETEC"). These commitments included: "DOE
15 will enter into an interagency agreement with EPA/Las Vegas to
16 conduct radiological characterization of the soil in Area IV."
17 Id. at 7865.

18 However, just one day before, on March 30, 2000, an internal
19 DOE memo, titled "Closure of DOE ETEC Site Activities-Divestiture,
20 Decontamination and Site Restoration-OAK NEPA Strategy, March
21 2000," was distributed to DOE employees, which seemed to
22 contradict these commitments. AR-114 at 6024. The memo contained
23 no mention of EPA involvement and nothing regarding further soil
24 testing. Id. at 6025. Rather, the memo recommended that an EA be
25 prepared, predicting that "a FONSI will result." Id. at 6026.
26 On September 15 2000, the DOE announced its intent to prepare an
27
28

1 EA "to evaluate the environmental effects of the Environmental
2 Restoration Project at the Energy Technology Engineering Center."
3 65 Fed. Reg. 55949-01 (2000).

4 The EPA apparently believed that the EA process would involve
5 redoing the Rocketdyne Survey with EPA participation. On May 31,
6 2001, the EPA sent a letter to Senator Feinstein in response to a
7 query by the Senator regarding the EPA's participation in the
8 remediation of Area IV. See AR-78 at 5746. The letter stated
9 inter alia:

10 The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will continue
11 to work with you and the local community to guide the
12 proper cleanup of Area IV. EPA is prepared to provide a
13 thorough radiological survey of Area IV, contingent upon
14 funding from the Department of Energy. EPA will closely
15 review the Department of Energy's activities and
16 radiological cleanup plans at the site and ensure that
17 the cleanup is consistent with Superfund cleanup
18 standards.

19 AR-78 at 5746. The EPA even went so far as to create a thirty-two
20 page document titled "Draft Scoping Document for Development of
21 Workplan for a Soil Remediation of Santa Susana Field Laboratory
22 Area IV," which laid out a detailed plan "to gather data regarding
23 the radiological conditions at the 290-acre Area IV parcel of the
24 SSFL." AR-308 at 12417, 12421. However, the planned survey with
25 the EPA was apparently never conducted and the EA was instead
26 based largely on the Rocketdyne Survey. See AR-264 at 11018.

27 C. The EA Process

28 As mentioned, in September 2000, the DOE announced its
intention to prepare an EA, pursuant to NEPA, "to evaluate the
environmental effects of the Environmental Restoration Project at

1 the Energy Technology Engineering Center (ETEC)." 65 Fed. Reg.
2 55949 (2000).

3 An EA is a document that, under NEPA, (1) provides
4 sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether
5 to prepare an environmental impact statement or a
6 finding of no significant impact; (2) aids an agency's
7 compliance with NEPA when no EIS is necessary; and (3)
8 facilitates preparation of an EIS when one is necessary.

9 Nat'l Parks and Conservation Assoc. v. Babbitt ("NPCA"), 241 F.3d
10 722, 728 (9th Cir. 2001) (internal quotations omitted).

11 The DOE characterizes its decision to prepare an EA as a
12 reaction to "acute interest in the SSFL cleanup shown by a few
13 outspoken individuals." Cross-Mot. at 6 (citing AR-264 at 10928,
14 which states that the DOE decided to prepare an EA "[a]s public
15 concern over cleanup activities at ETEC increased."). However,
16 the decision to prepare an EA, as opposed to preparing an EIS,
17 itself raised concern from some of those same individuals. See,
18 e.g., AR-275 (May 26, 2000 Letter from Senator Boxer to DOE,
19 expressing the Senator's "strong disagreement with the [DOE's]
20 recent decision to conduct an [EA]," rather than an EIS.)).

21 1. The Draft EA

22 In January 2002, the DOE issued a Draft EA. See AR-67. The
23 Draft EA covered the dismantling and demolition of approximately
24 sixty-four structures remaining in the ETEC: thirteen buildings
25 making up three radiological facilities, a sodium facility, and
26 fifty other facilities. See id. at 2-4. The Draft EA listed some
27 of the these facilities as radiologically contaminated. See id.
28 It also identified areas of radiologically contaminated soil in
Area IV, based on information derived from the Rocketdyne Survey.

1 See id. at 3-2. The Draft EA categorically excluded consideration
2 of possible chemical contamination, which, it states, "will be
3 considered in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)
4 Facility Investigation process." See id. at 1-2.

5 The Draft EA offered three alternatives for actions for
6 dealing with the situation at Area IV. See id. at 3-1.
7 Alternative 1, called for DOE "to clean up the ETEC site using the
8 DOE cleanup standard for decontamination of radiological
9 facilities and surrounding soils." Id. The Draft EA estimated
10 that application of this standard would result in an additional
11 15-millirem annual radiation dose to "the maximally exposed
12 individual," which would expose such a person to an additional
13 "lifetime cancer risk" of 3×10^{-4} , i.e. 3 in 10,000 individuals.
14 Id. To achieve this result, the Draft EA estimated that over the
15 course of five years the remaining buildings would be demolished
16 and soil would be removed from one location. See id. at 3-2.
17 Alternative 2 called for the use of a .05-millirem additional
18 annual dose, a 1×10^{-6} additional lifetime cancer risk standard.
19 See id. The EPA mandates the 1×10^{-6} additional lifetime cancer
20 risk standard as a default "point of departure for determining
21 remediation goals." 40 C.F.R. § 300.430(e)(2)(i)(A)(2).
22 Alternative 2 would require more soil removal than Alternative 1.
23 See id. at 3-8. Both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 assumed that
24 "[t]he SSFL RCRA corrective program (including ongoing groundwater
25 treatment) would continue." Id. at 3-1. Alternative 3 is the "No
26 Action Alternative," which proposed no cleanup of the site other
27
28

1 than continued groundwater treatment, and that Rocketdyne would
2 control access to the site. Id. Alternative 1 was identified as
3 the "DOE's preferred alternative." Id.

4 2. Comments on the Draft EA

5 Issuance of the Draft EA did even less to quell the interest
6 of "outspoken individuals" than the DOE's decision to prepare the
7 EA. Cross-Mot. at 6. Indeed, the Draft EA inspired significant
8 criticism from federal and state agencies, state and federal
9 politicians, and local community members. In total, the DOE
10 received sixteen oral comments and sixty-three written comments on
11 the Draft EA. See AR-264 at 10932. Plaintiffs state, and
12 Defendants do not refute, that all these comments were negative.
13 Pls' Opp. at 7, n. 4; see Defs' Reply.

14 a. EPA Comments on the Draft EA

15 The EPA was particularly outspoken in its criticism of the
16 Draft EA. See AR-80. The "key issues" the EPA had with the Draft
17 EA fell, generally, into three categories. Id. at 5916.

18 i. Ambiguity as to Purpose, Scope, and
19 Context

20 At a fundamental level, the EPA criticized the Draft EA for
21 failing "to provide a well-reasoned basis for the decision(s)"
22 contained, or referred to, therein. AR-80 at 5921. The Draft EA,
23 the EPA complained, "[did] not clearly identify the decision(s) to
24 be made, how those decisions relate to each other, or how and when
25 they will be made." Id. In this respect, the EPA criticized the
26 Draft EA particularly for: 1) not being clear whether the Draft
27 EA addresses only the ETEC or all of Area IV, and failing to
28

1 contain adequate analyses "of all pertinent closure issues" and
2 sites within the ETEC itself; 2) being "ambiguous and confusing in
3 its treatment of chemical contamination at the ETEC as it relates
4 to closure," vacillating between discussion of such contamination
5 and statements purporting to exclude such contamination from the
6 scope of the Draft EA; and 3) failing to describe how the DOE
7 would select, implement, or verify a remedy process, and failing
8 to describe the process by which the "ETEC and/or Area IV" would
9 be released for unrestricted use. Id.

10 ii. Conclusions in the Draft EA Regarding
11 Cleanup Based on Inadequate Standards and
12 Information

13 The EPA's comments stated bluntly: "The EPA believes that it
14 is premature to select 15 millirems per year (mrem/yr) as a
15 cleanup level or make any other cleanup decision, in the absence
16 of additional site investigation data sufficient to support a
17 risk-based cleanup evaluation . . . [and] that the CERCLA process
18 should be used to evaluate and select a cleanup alternative." AR-
19 80 at 5921.

20 (1) 15 mrem/yr, 3×10^{-4} Standard

21 The EPA's comments stated that the Draft EA's preferred
22 alternative's goal of achieving a 15 mrem/yr cleanup level and
23 thus an additional 3×10^{-4} cancer risk is contrary to CERCLA and
24 that the DOE should apply CERCLA's 1×10^{-6} departure point
25 standard. Id. In support, the comments cited documents which
26 reflect the DOE's policy since the mid-1990's of following CERCLA
27 in decommissioning activities, and sections of CERCLA which the
28

1 comments claimed require such compliance. See id. at 5921-22.
2 The comments took the DOE to task not only for the Draft EA's
3 apparent failure to comply with these requirements, but also for
4 its failure to address the project's consistency with these legal
5 requirements. See id. at 5927.

6 (2) Sufficiency of Basis of Information
7 on Radioactivity

8 Regarding the sufficiency of information on which the Draft
9 EA was based, the comments noted several shortcomings:

10 [The Draft EA] does not present or identify enough
11 measurements of radioactivity to support remedy
12 evaluations or decision, and many of the existing
13 measurements that did not detect contamination may have
14 used methods that were not sensitive enough to do so.
15 The instruments and methods used to collect the existing
16 data were not sensitive enough to detect levels needed
17 to support decisions about the need for cleanup, and not
18 enough measurements were made in enough places to
19 provide a thorough understanding of the location and
20 levels that may be present at the site. Additionally,
21 some of the measurements lack documentation of
22 collection conditions, precision, accuracy, and
23 reproducibility needed to demonstrate its utility and
24 justify its use.

25 Id. at 5923. As noted above, the Draft EA based most of its
26 radiological soil analysis on the Rocketdyne Survey. See AR-67 at
27 3-2.

28 iii. Range of Alternatives in Draft EA
Inadequate

The comments characterized the range of alternatives in the
Draft EA as "restricted" and "limited and incomplete." AR-80 at
5916; 5924. The comments stated that the "EPA and public have
identified several other alternatives in various forums but these"
were not considered in the Draft EA. Id. These included:

(1) using EPA's CERCLA approach to evaluate the need for and selection of any remedy; and (2) on-site active management and/or treatment of radiological materials to reduce potential impacts associated with transporting radiological waste materials treating waste on-site to reduce impact of transporting radiological materials off-site.

Id. Additionally, the comments suggested that the Draft EA should have considered other transportation options that might mitigate such impacts and the "inclusion of an alternative to evaluate the possible restrictions that might be imposed to prevent residential use on all or portions of the ETEC site might be necessary to meet NEPA requirements." Id. at 5924-25.

iv. EPA's Other Problems with the Draft EA

The EPA Comments also identified, inter alia, the following problems with the Draft EA:

- Failure to address the effects of possible contamination by other non-radiological "toxic or otherwise hazardous materials." Id. at 5924.
- Lack of any planned examination of other areas in Area IV besides the ETEC that might be radiologically or otherwise contaminated, including facilities that were decommissioned in the past according to non-NEPA standards. Id. 523-24.
- Failure to address radiological contamination of groundwater, see id. at 5925, and "the potential for migration of radioactivity and/or chemical contamination to groundwater or streambeds that carry stormwater, [or] . . . related risks to human health and the environment." Id. at 5924.
- Very high estimated impacts, in the form of truck traffic necessary for soil removal under Alternative 2, indicates possibly faulty calculations. See id. at 5925.
- Failure to provide bases for calculations and conclusions made in the Draft EA. See id. at 5926.

b. Comments by the California Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC")

The DTSC is a department of the California Environmental

1 Protection Agency which has a specific mandate to oversee the
2 cleanup of sites in California where hazardous substances have
3 been released and regulate entities that manage hazardous waste.
4 See Cal. Health & Safety Code § 58004.5. The DTSC's comments
5 reflect many of the same concerns as the EPA. See AR-81.

6 These concerns include: the insufficiency of "data to support
7 the assumptions used to estimate waste volume," id. at 5933;
8 problems with the "1995 characterization data" (i.e. the
9 Rocketdyne Survey) as a basis for assessment of alternatives, id.
10 at 5936; failure to address the need to reevaluate ground water
11 data, id. at 5933; failure to address past radiological releases
12 and their cleanup or "additional areas at ETEC where residual
13 radiological contamination may be present," id. at 5934; and
14 failure to address "multiple exposures, i.e., chemical and
15 radiological, as well as exposure to multiple radionuclides." Id.
16 at 5938.

17 c. Comments by the City of Los Angeles

18 The City of Los Angeles ("City") submitted comments on the
19 Draft EA which echoed many of the concerns raised by the DTSC and
20 EPA, with a particular emphasis on the lack of consideration paid
21 to potential effects of the proposed action on surrounding
22 communities. See AR-109. Reflecting the intensity of the City's
23 concern, the Los Angeles City Council issued a resolution on
24 January 29, 2002, with which the Mayor concurred, that, inter
25 alia, called on the DOE to "cease and desist from implementing
26 low-level clean-up standards at the former Rocketdyne nuclear
27

1 research facility in Simi Hills." AR-121 at 6080. The City is a
2 Plaintiff in the instant action. See Compl.

3 d. Comments by Federal and State Elected Officials

4 The Draft EA also elicited critical comments from federal and
5 state elected officials. Senator Boxer, who had previously sent
6 letters to the DOE criticizing its waste disposal procedures and
7 decision to prepare an EA rather than an EIS, see AR-275, sent a
8 letter to the DOE which criticized the Draft EA for, in
9 particular, the Preferred Alternative's plan to "leave behind 98
10 percent of the radioactively contaminated soil estimated to be
11 present" and the determination that the increased cancer rates
12 this would cause would be acceptable. AR-275 at 11999-11200.
13 California State Assembly Member Fran Pavely ("Assem. Mem.
14 Pavely") sent a letter to the DOE expressing similar concerns.
15 See id. at 12003-12004. Senator Boxer also co-authored with
16 Senator Feinstein a letter to the EPA, see id. at 12027-12028, and
17 the DOE, see id. at 12029-12030, which expressed the Senators'
18 concerns regarding the Draft EA.

19 e. Comments by Other Plaintiffs in the Instant
20 Action and Community Members

21 The DOE also received critical comments from other Plaintiffs
22 in the instant action and members of communities in the vicinity
23 of the SSFL reflecting many of the same concerns as others
24 discussed above. See AR-60; AR-78; AR-119; AR-336.

25 Notable among the comments by other Plaintiffs was that by
26 the Committee to Bridge the Gap ("CBG"). See AR-78. The CBG's
27 comments questioned inter alia those conclusions of the Draft EA
28

1 regarding suitability of the site for future residential use which
2 were based on the assumption that "everyone lives in a house with
3 a 4 inch concrete slab function . . .and everyone sleeps on the
4 second floor of a two story house." AR-78 at 5390. The DOE has
5 admitted basing its conclusions inter alia on this assumption.
6 See Answer at 9.

7 Roberta Mirzayans' comments are representative of community
8 members. See AR-60. Ms. Mirzayans identified herself as
9 "hav[ing] lived and worked more than 5 miles from the site for the
10 past thirty years and hav[ing] experienced birth defects and
11 cancer in my own family." AR-60 at 4811. Ms. Mirzayans took
12 particular issue with the fact that the EA did not cover "the
13 whole site," did not address the potential health effects of
14 "adjacent communities," and the acceptable rate of additional
15 cancer risk in the Draft EA's preferred alternative. Id.

16 3. DOE's Reaction to Comments-Final EA

17 In March 2003, the DOE issued its Final EA. See AR-264. The
18 Final EA is, for the most part, unchanged from the Draft EA, see
19 id.; AR-67, but does contain the following responses to the
20 criticisms discussed above.

21 a. Information on Radioactivity of Soil

22 In response to criticism of the bases of information used by
23 the DOE to determine the radioactivity of soil, and in particular
24 the use of the Rocketdyne Survey, the Final EA described the prior
25 "radiological characterization" as extensive, see AR-264 at 10997,
26 and stated that the DOE "believes [the Rocketdyne Survey] to be
27
28

1 valid for the purposes for which it was used." Id. at 11048. The
2 Final EA also clarified that, in addition to the Rocketdyne
3 survey, the Draft EA is based on a significantly smaller-scale
4 2000 survey of soil surrounding one of the radiological
5 facilities. See id. at 11018.

6 The Final EA dedicated six pages purportedly answering the
7 EPA's criticisms of the methodologies employed in the Rocketdyne
8 Survey. See id. at 11018-11025. However, this section also
9 admitted the following shortcomings in the Rocketdyne Survey: the
10 survey's method for spacing detection areas "was not designed or
11 intended to detect all potential levels of contamination at all
12 depths," id. at 11018; similarly, measurements using a Sodium
13 Iodide probe which was less than half as long as the EPA said
14 should have been used "were not designed, or intended, to detect
15 all potential levels of contamination at all depths," id. at
16 11019; "that a better job of segregating the laboratory data could
17 have been done," id. at 11021, and that "[t]he 5 microReoentgen
18 per hour action level used and its translation into 44 mrem per
19 year appears to be inconsistent with a cleanup standard of 15 mrem
20 per year." Id. at 11021. Lastly, the Final EA stated that a
21 "post-remediation characterization would be performed" and
22 "[a]dditional sampling and analysis would also be performed at any
23 sites suspected to be contaminated," but provided no information
24 regarding on what basis such a suspicion would arise. Id. at
25 10997; see also id. at 11000 (stating, "[i]f additional
26 radiological contamination is found at levels substantially beyond
27
28

1 that analyzed in the EA, the document will be modified," but not
2 discussing how such contamination might be found).

3 b. 15 mrem/yr, 3×10^{-4} Standard

4 The Final EA's chief response to criticism of Alternative 1's
5 15 mrem/yr, 3×10^{-4} standard, was that the actual level of
6 additional cancer risk will be between 1×10^{-5} and 1×10^{-6} . See
7 id. at 10096, 11043. As a basis for this disparity, the Final EA
8 pointed to the DOE's intention to apply a policy known as "as low
9 as reasonably achievable" ("ALAR") to the remediation work. Id.
10 at 10096. The Final EA did admit, however, that application of a
11 3×10^{-4} standard as opposed to 1×10^{-6} standard would result in
12 "allowing 10,000 times more radioactive soil" to remain in situ.
13 Id. at 11044.

14 c. Range of Alternatives

15 The Final EA did not respond in any detail to criticism of
16 the range of alternatives which the Draft EA offered.³ Rather,
17 the Final EA stated only that the "DOE initially considered
18 several alternatives but limited the detailed impacts to the 15
19 mrem and .05 mrem alternatives." Id. at 10998. In response to
20 the suggestion that an alternative which involved barring access
21 to the area should be considered, the Final EA stated that the DOE
22 does not have the authority to mandate such a situation. See id.
23 The Final EA further stated that while "Rocketdyne has no plans to
24

25 ³Defendants claim that "one of the alternatives explored in
26 detail in the EA was added at the request of commentators." Cross-
27 Mot. at 9 (citing AR-264 at 10931). However, both the Draft EA and
the Final EA appear to consider the same three alternatives. See
AR-264 at 10929-10931; AR-67 at 1-2 to 1-4.

1 release the site for public use anytime in the near future . . .
 2 [t]here is currently no restriction preventing the immediate of
 3 eventual development of the site for residential use." Id.

4 d. Responses to Other Concerns Raised

5 The Final EA contained the following responses to other
 6 concerns raised by EPA and others regarding the Draft EA:

- 7 • Regarding concerns over chemical contamination including
 8 possible chemical groundwater contamination: the final EA
 9 states that the cleanup of chemical contamination was being
 10 conducted according to a separate process, and that the DOE
 11 would only be responsible for the cleanup of "groundwater
 12 plumes that were created as a result of DOE-funded
 13 activities." Id. at 10998.
- 14 • Regarding possible cumulative effects of radiological and
 15 chemical contamination at the site: the Final EA reiterated
 16 that chemical cleanup will be conducted in a separate process
 17 and declined to consider any possible cumulative effects of
 18 the two types of contamination on the grounds that "[b]ecause
 19 any residual radioactive contamination from the DOE's cleanup
 20 will be in areas away from the chemical contamination, and
 21 the inability for a receptor to be in direct contact with
 22 separate portions of the site at the same time." Id. at
 23 10988.
- 24 • Regarding the geographic scope of the EA, the Final EA stated
 25 that the DOE would not survey the entire SSFL because it only
 26 has responsibility for the ETEC. See id. at 10997.
- 27 • Regarding other areas of the ETEC which have already been
 28 decommissioned according to a non-NEPA standard: the Final
 EA stated that they were not addressed because they were
 already remediated but that they would be analyzed as part of
 the final site evaluation post-cleanup. See id. at 10999-
 1100.
- Regarding conducting the remediation according to CERCLA:
 the Final EA stated that the DOE actions were consistent with
 CERCLA, in accordance with DOE policy, but made clear that
 the remediation would be performed under the DOE's authority
 flowing from the Atomic Energy Act. See id., at 10932,
 11042-11043.

4. Issuance of FONSI and Initiation of Remediation
 Work

On March 31, 2003, the DOE issued a Finding of No Significant Impact ("FONSI"). See AR-263. "As its title suggests, a FONSI states the reasons why an agency's proposed action will not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, it believes that the preparation of an EIS is unnecessary under NEPA." NPCA, 241 F.3d at 729. The three and a half page FONSI stated, in essence, that the DOE had conducted an EA in which it has considered the three alternatives discussed above and that the preferred alternative, Alternative 1, had been chosen. See AR-263 at 10915. The FONSI continued, "implementation of this alternative will be fully protective of future users of the site and does not significantly affect the quality of human health or the environment within the meaning of NEPA." Id. On this basis, and without significant explanation, the FONSI stated an EIS is not required. See id. Soon thereafter, the DOE began remediation work at the site. See Lopez Decl. at 1.

5. Reaction to the FONSI

In a July 2003 Report, the United States Senate Appropriations Committee expressed concerns about the DOE's decision to issue the FONSI and implement Alternative 1. See S. Rep. 108-105 (2004) at 94-96 (2003). In particular, the report noted the Committee's "concern[] that under the [DOE's] plans, the ETEC site will not be remediated to CERCLA standards" and the DOE's intention "to remediate 5,500 cubic meters of soil around one installation, leaving in place an additional 400,000 cubic meters of contaminated soil." Id. at 95. In conclusion, the

1 report stated:

2 This may represent an unacceptable deviation from the
3 Department's commitment in a 1995 Department of
4 Energy-EPA Joint Policy. Under that agreement, the
5 Department committed to fund an EPA radiological survey
6 of the ETEC site and to remediate the site to CERCLA
standards. The Committee urges the Department to fulfill
those commitments and reassess whether the decision
meets the joint policy and CERCLA standards.

7 Id. at 95-96.

8 In response, the DOE argued that the Joint Policy did not
9 refer specifically to the remediation of the ETEC, but confirmed
10 that the Joint Policy reflected the DOE's agreement to follow the
11 CERCLA process. See SAR-13. It further stated that the
12 remediation will be done to "a level consistent with the
13 acceptable [CERCLA] risk range" and "is fully protective of human
14 health and the environment." Id. at 1805.

15 The EPA, however, submitted further comments on December 2003
16 which made clear that it disagreed with this assessment. See id.
17 at 1765. The comments reiterated many of the same concerns the
18 EPA had already raised and took issue with the adequacy of the
19 DOE's response to them. See id. at 1765-1775. The comments noted
20 in particular that the radiological characterizations of the area
21 were inadequate and needed to be supplemented and that the DOE's
22 remediation plan was not consistent with CERCLA. See id. at 1765-
23 1766. In light of these concerns, the comments recommended that
24 if the DOE's chosen cleanup plan is unmodified, it should be
25 accompanied by restrictions on land use, such as limiting "access
26 . . . to day-use recreational activities with limitations on
27 picnic and camping facilities, other time consuming activities."
28

1 Id. at 1766.

2 In May 2004, the DOE announced that it had discovered levels
3 of radioactive contamination in groundwater monitoring wells in
4 Area IV that were four times the EPA's maximum level allowed for
5 drinking water. See SAR-13 at 1806.

6 On July 19, 2004, two Plaintiffs in the instant action, CBG
7 and the Natural Resources Defense Council submitted a letter to
8 the DOE, describing their continued concerns regarding DOE
9 remediation plans, and communicating their intention to sue. See
10 SAR-13.

11 On October 21, 2004, Plaintiffs filed the Complaint alleging:
12 1) that the DOE is violating NEPA and the APA by failing to
13 prepare an EIS; 2) that the DOE is violating CERCLA and the APA by
14 failing to conduct the remediation in accordance with CERCLA, its
15 implementing regulations, and the 1995 Joint Policy; and 3) that
16 the DOE is violating the ESA with respect to the impacts of the
17 remediation on the Braunton's Milk Vetch. See Compl. On the
18 basis of these allegations, Plaintiffs request relief as described
19 in the Introduction. See supra. In March 2006, Plaintiffs
20 submitted the instant Motion, see Docket No. 42; and in April
21 2006, Defendants responded with the instant Cross-Motion. See
22 Docket No. 47.

23 A few weeks prior to Plaintiffs' filing of the instant
24 Motion, the DOE received a response from the Fish and Wildlife
25 Service ("FWS") of the Department of the Interior to the DOE's
26 request for the FWS's "concurrence that [the remediation of Area
27

1 IV] is not likely to affect the federally threatened Baunton's
2 milk-vetch." Pl. Ex. 6. The FWS expressed its concurrence that
3 the plant would not likely be adversely affected by excavation of
4 uncontaminated material from a pit on the property to replace
5 contaminated material; nor would the use of roads during the
6 remediation likely negatively affect the plant. See id.

7 On June 14, 2006, the State of California filed an Amicus
8 Brief in the instant action in support of Plaintiffs. See Docket
9 Nos. 43, 58.

10
11 **III. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

12 Entry of summary judgment is proper "if the pleadings,
13 depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file,
14 together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no
15 genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is
16 entitled to judgment as a matter of law." F.R.C.P. 56(c).

17 "Summary judgment should be granted where the evidence is such
18 that it would require a directed verdict for the moving party."
19 Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 250 (1986). Thus,
20 "Rule 56(c) mandates the entry of summary judgment . . . against a
21 party who fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the
22 existence of an element essential to that party's case, and on
23 which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial." Celotex
24 Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). Conversely, entry of
25 summary judgment in a party's favor is appropriate when there are
26 no material issues of fact as to the essential elements of the
27

1 party's claim. Anderson, 477 U.S. at 247-49.

2
3 **IV. DISCUSSION**

4 A. NEPA

5 Plaintiffs' NEPA claim principally seeks an order from the
6 Court declaring the DOE in violation of NEPA and requiring the DOE
7 to prepare an EIS regarding the remediation of Area IV. See
8 Compl. at 27. In the alternative, the claim also seeks (more or
9 less clearly): an order remanding the case to DOE to explain why
10 an EIS is not necessary; an order declaring the EA inadequate
11 under NEPA and, thus, presumably, requiring that DOE redo the EA
12 process; and an order requiring that the DOE supplement the EA in
13 light of new facts. See Mot. at 31-36. The Court finds that the
14 DOE is in violation of NEPA and orders it to prepare an EIS
15 regarding the remediation of Area IV.⁴

16 1. NEPA Standard of Review

17 NEPA does not provide an independent cause of action; thus,
18 courts review claims alleging violations of NEPA under the APA, 5
19 U.S.C. § 706. ONRC Action v. Bureau of Land Mgmt., 150 F.3d 1132,
20 1135 (9th Cir. 1998). Thus, the Court reviews the DOE's decision
21 according to whether it was "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of
22 discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law." 5 U.S.C. §
23

24
25 ⁴In light of this holding, the Court declines to address any
26 of the Plaintiffs' alternative NEPA-related claims and requests for
27 relief. See generally Humane Soc'y of the United States v. Dep't
28 of Commerce, 423 F. Supp. 2d 4, 23 n. 13 (D.D.C. 2006) (noting that
having found an EIS was required, the court need not address the
sufficiency of the EA).

1 706(2)(A). More specifically, the Court must determine whether the
2 DOE's "decision was based on a consideration of the relevant
3 factors and whether there has been a clear error of judgment."
4 Akiak Native Comm. v. U.S. Postal Serv., 213 F.3d 1140, 1146 (9th
5 Cir. 2000).

6 In making this determination, the DOE's decision is "entitled
7 to a presumption of regularity," but that "presumption is not to
8 shield [its] action from a thorough, probing, in-depth review."
9 Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402,
10 415 (1971). And in evaluating the merits of Plaintiffs' claims,
11 the Court is generally limited to reviewing the administrative
12 record upon which the DOE based its decision. See 5 U.S.C. § 706;
13 Florida Power & Light Co. v. Lorion, 470 U.S. 729, 743-44 (1985).
14 However, the Court may consider "extra-record materials if
15 necessary to determine whether the agency has considered all
16 relevant factors and has explained its decision." See Earth
17 Island Inst. v. United States Forest Serv., 442 F.3d 1147, 1162
18 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal quotations omitted).

19 2. Preparation of an EIS is Required

20 After a thorough, probing, in-depth review of the AR, the
21 Court finds that Plaintiffs have established, as a matter of law,
22 that the DOE's decision to issue a FONSI rather than prepare an
23 EIS was not in accordance with the law and constituted a clear
24 error of judgment.

25 "The EIS is a procedural obligation designed to assure that
26 agencies give proper consideration to the environmental
27

1 consequences of their actions. The EIS also insures that the
2 public is informed about the environmental impact of proposed
3 agency actions." Douglas County v. Babbitt, 48 F.3d 1495, 1498
4 (9th Cir. 1995) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

5 NEPA requires that an agency prepare an EIS for any "major
6 Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human
7 environment." 42 U.S.C. § 4332(C). The Ninth Circuit has
8 clarified the meaning of this standard:

9 An EIS must be prepared if substantial questions are
10 raised as to whether a project may cause significant
11 degradation of some human environmental factor. To
12 trigger this requirement a plaintiff need not show that
13 significant effects will in fact occur, but raising
14 substantial questions whether a project may have
15 significant effect is sufficient.

16 Ocean Advocates v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 402 F.3d 846,
17 864-65 (9th Cir. 2005) (internal quotations and modifications
18 omitted; emphasis in original).

19 Where, as here, the agency prepares an EA in the first
20 instance, the agency must prepare an EIS "[i]f the EA establishes
21 that the agency's action may have a significant effect upon the
22 environment." NPCA, 241 F.3d at 730. Otherwise, "the agency must
23 issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), accompanied by a
24 convincing statement of reasons to explain why a project's impacts
25 are insignificant." Id. (internal quotations and modifications
26 omitted).

27 The Council on Environmental Quality has enacted regulations
28 interpreting NEPA that are "binding on all Federal agencies for
implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA." 40 C.F.R. §

1 1500.3. These regulations make clear that the potential
2 "significance" of an action's effect must be analyzed in terms of
3 both its "context and intensity," and list ten factors that an
4 agency should consider in determining the intensity of a proposed
5 action. See 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27. The Ninth Circuit has held that
6 the existence of "one of these factors may be sufficient to
7 require preparation of an EIS in appropriate circumstances."
8 Ocean Advocates, 402 F.3d at 865.

9 Plaintiffs principally argue that preparation of an EIS is
10 required based on two of the factors listed in Section 1508.27(b):
11 1) "[t]he degree to which the effects on the quality of the human
12 environment are likely to be highly controversial," 40 C.F.R. §
13 1508.27(b)(4); and 2) "[t]he degree to which the possible effects
14 on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or
15 unknown risks." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(5). See Mot. at 25-27.

16 Secondly, Plaintiffs argue that the DOE's planned
17 remediation implicates the following four Section 1508.27 factors:
18 1) degree of its effect on "public health or safety," 40 C.F.R. §
19 1508.27(b)(2); 2) its potential to "establish a precedent for
20 future actions with significant effects," 40 C.F.R. §
21 1508.27(b)(6); 3) its potential to have a "cumulatively
22 significant impact" in combination with other related actions, 40
23 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(7); and 4) and its potential to violate
24 "Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the
25 protection of the environment," 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(10). See
26 Mot. at 28-30.

1 In addition to refuting these arguments, the DOE argues that
2 because the remediation is a cleanup it cannot be said to
3 significantly affect the environment in a manner that would
4 require the DOE to prepare an EIS. See Cross-Mot. at 15. The
5 Court addresses the latter argument first.

6 a. Characterization as Cleanup Doesn't Exempt the
7 Remediation from EIS Requirement

8 The DOE's argument that the remediation is categorically
9 excluded from the requirement to prepare an EIS by virtue of being
10 a cleanup fails for several reasons.

11 First, this argument fails because the focus of the law is
12 not simply on the potential effect of an action on the natural
13 environment, but on the human environment. The remediation of
14 Area IV creates a strong potential for such an effect.

15 NEPA unambiguously states that the requirement to do an EIS
16 is triggered by "major Federal actions significantly affecting the
17 quality of the human environment." 42 U.S.C. § 4332(c) (emphasis
18 added); see also Ocean Advocates, 402 F.3d at 864 ("may cause
19 significant degradation of some human environmental factor").
20 Lest there be any confusion, the regulations make clear that
21 "human environment," as used in NEPA, is to be "interpreted
22 comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment
23 and the relationship of people with that environment." 40 C.F.R.
24 § 1508.14.

25 The regulations further state that when determining whether
26 an action may have significant effects on the human environment,
27 direct effects and indirect effects are to be considered. See 40
28

1 C.F.R. § 1508.8 The latter category includes "effects related to
2 induced changes in the pattern of land use, population or growth
3 rate." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8 (b).

4 Without question, the remediation of Area IV has the
5 potential to induce changes in the pattern of land use and
6 population in the area in a manner which would affect the
7 relationship between people and the natural environment. The
8 Final EA states that "[a]llthough currently an industrial facility,
9 future use of the property for residential purpose is probable."
10 AR-264 at 10961. In response to an EPA suggestion that the DOE
11 consider an alternative that would involve preventing human access
12 to the site, the DOE states:

13 Access to the site is currently being controlled by
14 Rocketdyne. DOE cannot determine the long-term use of
15 the site. Rocketdyne has no plans to release the site
16 for public use anytime in the near future and will
17 maintain control of the site. There is currently no
18 restriction preventing the immediate or eventual
19 development of the site for residential use.

20 AR-264 at 10998. It is of no event that these statements do not
21 express with certainty that use of the site will switch from
22 industrial to residential following the remediation, or that such
23 a switch could theoretically be initiated absent the remediation.
24 It is sufficient that the remediation could potentially induce
25 such a shift. See generally Ocean Advocates, 402 F.3d at 864.
26 And, in fact, the Final EA's estimates of potential increased
27 cancer rates are partly based on exposure rates for individuals
28 presumed to be "residing on the site." Id. at 10975, 10977.
Thus, the remediation creates the substantial possibility of a

1 significant effect on the human environment as the phrase is used
2 in NEPA.

3 Second, the DOE's belief that the remediation will have, on
4 the whole, a positive effect on the natural environment does not
5 remove it from scrutiny under NEPA. See Mot. at 15. Section
6 1508.8 makes clear that when determining whether preparation of an
7 EIS is necessary, effects to consider "may also include those
8 resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and
9 detrimental effects, even if on balance the agency believes that
10 the effect will be beneficial." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8.

11 Thus, the Ocean Advocates court rejected the Corp of
12 Engineers' claim that because its planned addition to an oil
13 refinery dock would decrease the chances of an oil spill while
14 tankers were moored, it need not prepare an EIS on the project.
15 Ocean Advocates, 402 F.3d at 865-866. Rather, the court found
16 that, even if you accepted this claim at face value, it was not
17 sufficient in light of the Corp's failure to address whether the
18 project could also increase the risk of oil spills by encouraging
19 increased tanker traffic at the dock. Id. at 866.

20 Similarly, in this case, the remediation could well leave the
21 site less radioactively contaminated than before and thereby
22 improve the quality of the site's natural environment. However,
23 as just discussed, the remediation also has the potential to
24 induce people to move to and reside in the site, which would
25 elevate the risk of people's exposure to such contamination.
26 Further, the remediation is likely to cause a significant
27

1 disturbance to some parts of the site's natural environment. The
2 remediation calls for excavation of 5,500 cubic tons of
3 contaminated soil from the site to be replaced in part by other
4 uncontaminated soil excavated elsewhere on the site. See AR-264
5 at 10949-10950. It further predicts close to 2500 truck shipments
6 being required. See id. at 10952. Thus, the possibility that
7 the remediation could have some positive impacts on the natural
8 environment of the site does not alleviate the responsibility to
9 determine whether it could also adversely effect other elements of
10 the human environment.⁵

11 Finally, Douglas County, 48 F.3d 1495, which the DOE
12 selectively quotes in support for their position, is inapposite.
13 See Cross-Mot at 16, n. 18. The broad holding of Douglas County
14 has nothing to do with the instant situation: NEPA procedures are
15 not required where the agency action will simply maintain an area
16 in its natural state. 48 F.3d at 1505. Area IV is far from being
17 in its natural state, see AR-264 at 10961, and the planned
18 remediation calls for significant alterations, such as the
19 installation of equipment, demolition of structures, and
20 excavation of soil. See id. at 10947-10952.

21 The more narrow holdings of Douglas County, from which the
22 DOE's quoted language comes, has even less to do with the instant
23

24
25 ⁵ Additionally, though the Court need not resolve the issue at
26 this time, the Court is not completely convinced that the DOE's
27 statement in another action "that both beneficial and adverse
28 effects on the environment can be significant within the meaning of
NEPA, and thus require an EIS," is not correct. NRDC v.
Herrington, 768 F.2d 1355, 1431 (D.C. Cir. 1985).

1 situation. See Cross-Mot. at 16, n. 18. The complete passage
2 reads: "As with the decision to list a species under the ESA, the
3 decision to preserve critical habitat for a species protects the
4 environment from exactly the kind of human impacts that NEPA is
5 designed to foreclose." Id. at 1507. In context, this statement
6 refers to a situation wherein the procedures of another statutory
7 regime aimed at protecting the environment make NEPA-based
8 procedures "superfluous." Douglas County, 48 F.3d at 1503 There
9 is no statutory regime that could arguably displace NEPA here.
10 Indeed, the DOE's own regulations make clear that NEPA governs
11 this and similar situations. See 10 C.F.R § 1021.400 (titled,
12 "Level of NEPA review."). Thus, the DOE's creative editing of the
13 quotation so as to make it read "no EIS is required where the
14 decision at issue 'protects the environment from exactly the kind
15 of human impact NEPA is designed to foreclose,'" is unavailing.
16 Cross-Mot. at 16, n. 18.

17 Finally, simply characterizing the remediation as a cleanup
18 does not eliminate the potentially significant effects which
19 cleanup procedures may have on the natural environment. Thus,
20 even if the Court was to accept that only potential effects on the
21 natural environment were relevant, which it doesn't, the
22 remediation would not be categorically exempted from the possible
23 requirement of an EIS review by virtue of the DOE's
24 characterization of it as a cleanup.

25
26 b. The DOE's Remediation Decision is Highly
27 Controversial
28

1 The DOE's remediation decision is highly controversial under
2 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(4). An action is controversial "when
3 substantial questions are raised as to whether a project may cause
4 significant degradation of some human environmental factor, or
5 there is a substantial dispute about the size, nature, or effect
6 of the major Federal action." NPCA, 241 F.3d at 736 (internal
7 quotations and modifications omitted). The DOE's decision
8 regarding the remediation of Area IV meets this standard.

9 The above NPCA standard uses the disjunctive "or" to separate
10 what appears to be two possible bases for finding that an action
11 is controversial: a "substantial question" basis and a
12 "substantial dispute" basis. NPCA, 241 F.3d at 736. However, in
13 application, the substantial question basis rarely, if ever, is
14 applied independently of a substantial dispute analysis. See,
15 e.g., id. at 736-37; Greenpeace Action v. Franklin, 14 F.3d 1324,
16 at 1333-34 (9th Cir. 1992); Found. for N. Am. Wild Sheep v. Dep't
17 of Transp. ("FNAWS"), 681 F.2d 1172, 1178-79, 1182 (9th Cir.
18 1982); California v. Dep't of Transp., 260 F. Supp. 2d 969, 973
19 (N.D. Cal. 2003). The distinguishing factor of a substantial
20 question analysis is an additional focus on the scale and quality
21 of the comments received by the agency, including whether the
22 comments came from an individual or entity with expertise in a
23 relevant area. See NPCA, 241 F.3d at 736 (describing the receipt
24 of approximately 450 comments, 85% negative, as "more than
25 sufficient to meet the 'outpouring of public protest' discussed in
26 Greenpeace Action, 14 F.3d at 1334"); FNAWS, 681 F.2d at 1182
27
28

(citing "numerous responses from conservationists, biologists, and other knowledgeable individuals, all highly critical of EA," including from "[b]oth the California State Department of Natural Resources and California State Department of Fish and Game."); California v. Dep't of Transp., 260 F. Supp. 2d 969, 973 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (citing "the volume of comments from and the serious concerns raised by federal and state agencies specifically charged with protecting the environment," noting also that the "special expertise" of these agencies increased the significance of their comments.). In light of this, the proper analysis is to look at the quantity and quality of the comments elicited by the action prior to the issuance of a FONSI or EIS and then apply the two-part substantial dispute test described immediately below.

The two-part test for finding a substantial dispute, articulated by the Ninth Circuit in NPCA, is:

A substantial dispute exists when evidence, raised prior to the preparation of an EIS or FONSI, casts serious doubt upon the reasonableness of an agency's conclusions. NEPA then places the burden on the agency to come forward with a well-reasoned explanation demonstrating why those responses disputing the EA's conclusions do not suffice to create a public controversy based on potential environmental consequences.

241 F.3d at 736 (internal citations omitted). In the course of this analysis, "a court should not take sides in a battle of the experts, [but rather] it must decide whether the agency considered conflicting expert testimony in preparing its FONSI, and whether the agency's methodology indicates that it took a hard look at the proposed action by reasonably and fully informing itself of the

1 appropriate facts." Id. at 736 n. 14. (internal citations
2 omitted). As used in this standard, "the term 'well reasoned
3 explanation' is simply a less direct way of saying that the
4 explanation must be convincing." Id. at 736. (internal
5 citations omitted).

6 i. Quantity and Quality of Comments Received
7 regarding the EA

8 The comments received by the DOE after its issuance of the
9 EA, but prior to its issuance of the FONSI, meet both the
10 quantitative and qualitative legs of the substantial question
11 test.

12 The DOE received a total of sixteen oral comments and sixty-
13 three written comments. See AR-264 at 10932. Plaintiffs state,
14 and Defendants do not refute, that all of these comments were
15 negative. See Pls' Opp. at 7, n. 4; Defs' Reply. Commentators
16 included: the EPA, see AR-80; the DTSC, a division of the
17 California state equivalent to the EPA, see AR-81; the City of Los
18 Angeles, see AR-109; United States Senators Barbara Boxer and
19 Dianne Feinstein, see AR-275; California State Assembly Member
20 Fran Pavely, see id.; large numbers of neighboring community
21 members, see AR-60; and local community groups and national
22 environmental organizations, see AR-60; AR-78; AR-119; AR-336.

23 This easily meets the "outpouring of public protest"
24 quantitative standard. NPCA, 241 F.3d at 736 (internal quotation
25 omitted).

26 It also meets the qualitative standard. Not only does the
27 list of commentators contain several very prominent elected
28

1 officials and entities, but also the EPA and the DTSC,
2 respectively the federal and California state agencies
3 specifically tasked to deal with environmental issues like the
4 remediation of Area IV. The DOE argues that the EPA is not an
5 expert on the remediation on the ground that "EPA has no
6 jurisdiction over cleanup at ETEC." Cross-Mot. at 17. Setting
7 aside the fact that jurisdiction and expertise are two totally
8 different things, this argument is laughable in light of the
9 nature of authority which Congress has granted the EPA. See,
10 e.g., Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, reprinted in 5 U.S.C.
11 App. 1 at 397 (listing among the principal functions to be
12 transferred to the EPA, "Environmental radiation standards
13 programs" formerly held by the DOE's predecessor, the Atomic
14 Energy Commission), 399 (listing among the "[r]oles and functions
15 of EPA . . . [t]he establishment and enforcement of environmental
16 standards and enforcement of environmental protection standards
17 consistent with national environmental goals."). Indeed, the
18 Final EA admits these expertises. See AR-264 at 10937. The DTSC
19 is similarly well qualified to comment on the potential human
20 environmental effects of the DOE's actions. See Cal. Health &
21 Safety Code § 58004.5. The comments of these agencies thus carry
22 additional weight in the Court's conclusion that the DOE's
23 decision raised substantial questions. See FNAWS, 681 F.2d at
24 1182; California, 260 F. Supp. 2d at 973.

25
26 Finally, as previously discussed, the concerns raised by the
27 EPA, the DTSC, and others were lengthy, detailed, particular, and
28

1 based on well-articulated, firm, scientific basis. Thus, the
2 Court, has no hesitation in concluding that substantial questions
3 were raised by the EA. See, California, 260 F. Supp. 2d at 973.

4 ii. Substantial Dispute Exists

5 Following the issuance of the FONSI, there remains
6 "substantial dispute about the size, nature, or effect" of the
7 planned remediation of EA. NPCA, 241 F.3d at 736. The DOE's
8 attempt to characterize the dispute as simply a "policy divide"
9 between it and the EPA over NEPA requirements is unavailing. See
10 Cross-Mot. at 16, 18.

11 Evidence contained in comments received by the DOE before
12 issuing the FONSI, particularly comments from the EPA and DTSC,
13 "casts serious doubt upon the reasonableness of [the DOE's]
14 conclusions." NPCA, 241 F.3d at 736. This includes, inter alia,
15 evidence that: the Rocketdyne Survey, on which most of the soil
16 radioactivity information in the Final EA was based, was riddled
17 with problems, see AR-80 at 5923; the 15 mrem/yr, 3×10^{-4} cleanup
18 exposure standard improperly placed future residents of the site
19 at an increased cancer risk many times higher than CERCLA allows,
20 see id. at 5921-22; the EA had not examined locations in Area IV
21 in which radiological contamination might exist, see id. at 5923-
22 24; the EA had not examined possible non-radiological
23 contamination and the possible effects such contamination could
24 have in combination with radioactive contamination, see id.; and
25 the EA had not examined possible radiological contamination of
26 groundwater, see id. at 5924-25.

1 Faced with this evidence, the DOE did not meet its burden
2 "to come forward with a well-reasoned explanation demonstrating
3 why those responses disputing the EA's conclusions do not suffice
4 to create a public controversy based on potential environmental
5 consequences." NPCA, 241 F.3d at 736. Rather, it left many
6 concerns raised by commentators unaddressed or only cursorily
7 addressed. See AR-264. The DOE's response regarding the
8 Rocketdyne Survey was that the survey wasn't designed to be as
9 sensitive as the EPA suggested it should have been and that it had
10 some problems, but was adequate; the DOE does not explain how it
11 reached that conclusion, but suggests any problems with the survey
12 can be remedied by an unexplained post hoc survey. See id. at
13 11018-11025. Regarding the 15 mrem/yr, 3×10^{-4} cleanup exposure
14 standard, the DOE responded that because it planned to apply an
15 ALAR standard, in all likelihood the level would be lower. See
16 id. at 10096. Regarding possible cumulative effects of
17 radioactive contamination and contamination from other sources,
18 the EA states that the chemical contamination is being dealt with
19 independently and that cumulative effects of chemical and
20 radioactive contamination need not be addressed because the EA
21 assumes that no single specific location could contain both and
22 thus no person could be simultaneously exposed to both. See id.
23 at 10998. Of course, this fails to deal with the reality that
24 potential site residents and visitors would be mobile. The DOE's
25 responses to other concerns were a combination of unjustified
26 assumptions, refusals of responsibility, and promises of undefined
27
28

1 post hoc evaluations. See supra.

2 This indicates that the DOE did not take a hard look at the
3 evidence offered by commentators, and falls far short of a well
4 reasoned explanation. See NPCA, 241 F.3d at 736. The strongly
5 negative and detailed criticism which greeted the DOE's decision
6 to issue a FONSI, see supra, supports this conclusion. See, Earth
7 Island Inst. v. United States Forest Serv., 442 F.3d 1147, 1162
8 (9th Cir. 2006).

9 The Court, therefore, has no problem concluding that the
10 DOE's remediation decision was highly controversial. On this
11 basis alone, the Court would feel comfortable ordering the DOE to
12 prepare an EIS.

13 c. Uncertainty and Unknown Risks of the DOE's
14 Remediation Decision

15 The DOE's remediation decision also presents "possible
16 effects on the human environment [which] are highly uncertain or
17 involve unique or unknown risks." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(5).

18 The Ninth Circuit has stated bluntly: "An agency must
19 generally prepare an EIS if the environmental effects of a
20 proposed action . . . are highly uncertain or involve unique or
21 unknown risks." N.P.C.A., 241 F.3d at 731-32. The potential
22 efficacy of further study indicates that the effects of a proposed
23 action are highly uncertain or involve unique risks. Id.
24 "Preparation of an EIS is mandated where uncertainty may be
25 resolved by further collection of data, or where the collection of
26 such data may prevent speculation on potential effects. The
27 purpose of an EIS is to obviate the need for speculation by
28

1 insuring that available data are gathered and analyzed prior to
2 the implementation of the proposed action." Id. (internal
3 quotations, citations, and modifications omitted).

4 As discussed above, the EPA and others have raised
5 substantial questions regarding, inter alia: the efficacy of the
6 survey used to determine the radioactivity of the site's soil; the
7 geographic scope of the EA; the exclusion from study of non-
8 radiological contamination and its possible interaction with
9 radiological contamination; and the failure to address
10 radiological ground water contamination. See supra. These
11 questions regarding the sufficiency of information on which the EA
12 was based, as well as questions regarding the manner in which the
13 EA evaluated that data, creates high levels of uncertainty
14 regarding what environmental effects the remediation will
15 ultimately have. As a result, it leaves those living, working,
16 and recreating in areas surrounding the site, not to mention the
17 site's potential residential occupants, subject to the possibility
18 of as yet undiscovered, unknown risks.

19 The Court, therefore, would also feel comfortable ordering
20 the DOE to prepare an EIS exclusively on the basis of the
21 uncertainty and unknown risks caused by the inadequacy of the data
22 and analyses on which the EA is based.

23 d. Additional Significance Factors

24 Plaintiffs' showing regarding each of the two Section 1508.27
25 significance factors just discussed provide sufficient basis for
26 the Court to order the DOE to prepare an EIS. The Court notes,
27
28

1 nonetheless, that several other significance factors support this
2 conclusion.

3 First, the DOE's decision deals with a site that is known to
4 be radioactively contaminated, was the location of nuclear
5 accidents in the past, is not far from current population centers,
6 and is likely to be developed for residential purposes in the
7 future. See supra. Thus, the remediation decision carries the
8 possibility of negatively affecting "public health or safety." 40
9 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b) (2) .

10 Second, as discussed above, the EA does not address
11 contamination from other non-radiological sources--though it
12 admits their existence--and the possible combined health effects
13 of such contamination with radioactive contamination. See supra.
14 Thus, the remediation decision regarding radiological
15 contamination potentially will have a "cumulatively significant
16 impact" in combination with other related actions regarding
17 nonradiological contamination. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b) (7) .

18 The DOE has stated that whatever cleanup level is chosen "at
19 the ETEC could set a precedent for other DOE sites across the
20 nation." AR-24 at 2999. Thus, the DOE's remediation decision
21 has, in the DOE's own words, the potential to "establish a
22 precedent for future actions with significant effects." 40 C.F.R.
23 § 1508.27(b) (6) .⁶
24

25 ⁶In light of the Court's holding regarding the CERCLA and ESA
26 based claims, the Court declines to address Plaintiffs' argument
27 regarding "[w]hether the action threatens a violation of Federal,
28 State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of
the environment." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b) (10)

1 3. NEPA Conclusion

2 In conclusion, the Court finds overwhelming support for
3 Plaintiffs' argument that the DOE's decision to prepare a FONSI
4 and conduct the remediation of Area IV on the basis of the Final
5 EA, rather than prepare an EIS, is in violation of NEPA. The
6 Section 1508.27 significance factors just discussed, which go to
7 the intensity of the action, point strongly in favor of this
8 conclusion. However, in addition, the context in which this
9 decision has been taken strongly favors this conclusion. Area IV
10 is known to be radiologically contaminated and, in fact, was the
11 location of at least one well-known nuclear meltdown. See supra.
12 It is located only miles away from one of the largest population
13 centers in the world and, in all probability, will become a part
14 of that center. Among the primary purposes of NEPA, and the EIS
15 process more specifically, is assuring that the public is informed
16 and aware of the potential environmental impacts of government
17 actions. See Douglas County, 48 F.3d at 1498. It is difficult
18 to imagine a situation where the need for such an assurance could
19 be greater.

20 B. CERCLA and ESA

21 Having found that the DOE is in violation of NEPA and must
22 prepare an EIS, the Court finds no value in addressing Plaintiffs'
23 CERCLA and ESA claims, which address the process that the Court
24 has now ordered redone. Should Plaintiffs come to believe that a
25 future action or actions by the DOE give rise to a claim or claims
26 based on the ESA, CERCLA, or both, they are free to bring such a
27
28

1 claim or claims before the Court at that time.

2
3 **V. CONCLUSION**

4 For the reasons stated herein, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs'
5 Motion for Summary Judgment as it relates to Plaintiffs' NEPA
6 claim, and hereby DECLARES that the DOE has violated and continues
7 to violate NEPA. The Court further PERMANENTLY ENJOINS the
8 Department of Energy from transferring ownership or possession, or
9 otherwise relinquishing control over, any portion of Area IV until
10 the Department of Energy has completed an EIS and issued a Record
11 of Decision pursuant to NEPA. The Court further AWARDS Plaintiffs
12 costs, disbursements, and attorneys' fees reasonably expended in
13 their work up to this date which has caused in the instant result.
14 The Court will retain jurisdiction over this matter until it is
15 satisfied that the DOE has met its legal obligations as they
16 relate to the remediation of Area IV.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19
20
21 Dated: May 2, 2007

22
23 

24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE